

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on October 17, 2005 in which Claims 1-25 were rejected. With this response, Claims 23-25 are amended and Claims 26-31 are added. Claims 1-31, as amended, are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Rejection of Claims 23-25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action rejected Claims 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 on the alleged basis that the claimed invention recited in Claims 23-25 is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Claims 23-25 are each amended to recite that the program product is embodied on "computer readable medium" as suggested in the Office Action. Claims 23-25 are further amended to recite that the computer readable medium comprises at least one of hardware and software, clarifying the meaning of the term "computer readable medium". Accordingly, Claims 23-25, as amended, overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Based Upon Smith.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith II, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0113994. As noted above, Claims 23-25 are amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Based on the remarks which follow, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-25 based upon Smith be withdrawn.

A. Claims 1 and 23.

Claim 1 recites a method of printing using a mobile device. The method includes generating on the mobile device an archive file containing remote content, transmitting a print request to an imaging device, receiving a file request from the imaging device for the archive file and transmitting the archive file to the imaging device, whereby the imaging device prints the content. As known to those of

ordinary skill in the art, an “archive file” is a group of files compressed in a single file to preserve space. Non-limiting examples of archive file formats include ZIP, TAR, ARJ, LZH, UC2.

Claim 23 recites a computer program product for mobile printing wherein the steps recited in Claim 1 are embodied as code in a computer readable medium comprising at least one of hardware and software.

Smith fails to disclose a method of printing using a mobile device wherein an archive file containing remote content is generated on the mobile device. Smith fails to disclose receiving a file request from the imaging device for the archive file or transmitting the archive file to the imaging device. In contrast, in the method disclosed by Smith, the mobile device merely receives truncated information which serves as an identification tag for full-length information on a server. The truncated information, serving as an identification tag, merely allows the portable device to identify to the server what full-information on the server should be sent to a printer by the server. (See ¶¶ 19-22 and 45-48 of Smith.)

In rejecting Claim 1, the Office Action refers to paragraphs 39-41 of Smith for its assertion that Smith discloses generating on a mobile device an archive file containing the remote content, receiving a file request from the imaging device for the archive file and transmitting the archive file to the imaging device, whereby the imaging device prints the content. However, nowhere do paragraphs 39-41 disclose that (1) the portable device generates an archive file or (2) that the imaging device or printer transmits a file request (see claim limitation reciting the step of receiving a file request from the imaging device) or (3) that an archive file is transmitted to the imaging device. At most, paragraph 41 generally describes a print by reference process already described in paragraph 5 under the heading “Introduction” in the present application.

Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1 and 23 based upon Smith should be withdrawn. Claims 2-8 depend from Claim 1 and are patentably distinct over Smith for the same reasons.

B. Claims 9 and 24.

Claim 9 recites a method of printing using a mobile service. The method includes generating on a proxy server an archive file containing remote content, receiving a file request at the proxy server from the imaging device for the archive file and transmitting the archive file from the proxy server to the imaging device, whereby the imaging device prints the content of the archive file.

Claim 24 recites a computer program product embodied in a computer readable medium comprising at least one of software and hardware, wherein the medium includes code embodying the same steps as recited in Claim 9.

Smith fails to disclose the method recited in Claim 9 or the computer program product of Claim 24. Smith fails to disclose a method of printing using a mobile device wherein an archive file is generated on a proxy server and transmitted from the proxy server to an imaging device or wherein the file request is received at the proxy server from the imaging device for the archive file. In contrast, Smith discloses that its server generates truncated information which merely serves as an identification tag. This truncated information does not appear to be an archive file. Moreover, Smith does not disclose that this truncated information is transmitted from the proxy server to an imaging device or printer. Rather, only the formatted full-length information is sent from the server to the printer. Moreover, nowhere does Smith disclose that its server receives a file request from an imaging device or printer.

In rejecting Claim 9, the Office Action refers to paragraphs 40 and 41 for its assertion that Smith discloses generating on a proxy server an archive file containing remote content, receiving a file request at the proxy server from the imaging device for the archive file and transmitting the archive file from the proxy server to the imaging device. However, as noted above, paragraphs 40-41 do not support any of these assertions. At most, paragraph 41 merely describes the general print by reference process already described in paragraph 5 in the "Introduction" section of the present application. Nowhere do paragraphs 40 and 41 teach that the proxy

server generates an archive file and subsequently transmits this archive file to printer imaging device. Nowhere do new paragraphs 40 and 41 indicate that the proxy server receives a file request from the imaging device or printer. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 9 and 24 should be withdrawn. Claims 10-15 depend from Claim 9 and are patentable distinct over Smith for the same reasons.

C. Claims 16 and 25.

Claim 16 recites a method of printing using a mobile device. The method includes generating on a proxy server an archive file containing remote content, receiving a file request from the imaging device for the archive file, transmitting the file request to the proxy server and streaming the archive file from the mobile device to the imaging device, whereby the imaging device prints the content.

Claim 25 recites a computer program product embodied in a computer readable medium comprising at least one of software and hardware, wherein the computer readable medium includes code for performing the method steps recited in Claim 16.

Smith fails to disclose a method of printing using a mobile device which includes generating on a proxy server an archive file containing remote content, receiving a file request from the imaging device for the archive file or streaming a data stream of the archive file from the mobile device to the imaging device, whereby the imaging device prints the content. In contrast, Smith discloses a process wherein the server truncates or compresses information (see ¶ 45) and wherein the truncated information merely serves as an identification tag for the portable device to select printing of particular information. Once the truncated information is selected, the truncated information is transmitted to the server which then transmits the formatted full-length information to a printer (see ¶¶ 47 and 48).

In rejecting Claim 16, the Office Action once again relies upon paragraphs 40 and 41 for its assertion that Smith discloses a proxy server generating an archive file containing remote content, for receiving a file request from the imaging device for an

archive file. However, nowhere do paragraphs 40 and 41 disclose that the server generates an archive file or that the imaging device transmits a file request for the archive file.

The Office Action additionally relies on paragraphs 49-52 for its assertion that Smith discloses streaming the data stream of the archive file from the mobile device to the imaging device. However, nowhere do paragraphs 49-52 disclose streaming an archive file from the mobile device to the imaging device. Rather paragraph 51 clearly states that:

The full-length information is reformatted, at 1041, and sent to the high capacity presentation apparatus, at 1043. Upon receipt, at 1045, the high capacity presentation apparatus (user equipment 113) prints the full-length information on a printer (printer 115), at 1047.

This information is transmitted from the server, not the portable device, to the imaging device. Moreover, this information is not an archive file but is the full information. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 16 and 25 based upon Smith should be withdrawn. Claims 17-22 depend from Claim 16 and are patentably distinct over Smith for the same reasons.

D. Claims 3, 10 and 17.

Claims 3, 10 and 17 depend from Claims 1, 9 and 16, respectively, and recite that the remote content comprises a web page containing a link to a reference content and that the step of generating an archive file comprises rewriting the link to refer to a reference content file in the archive file.

Smith fails to disclose generating an archive file which includes rewriting the link to reference content in a web page which would refer to reference content file in the archive file. The Office Action refers to paragraphs 40 and 41 in its rejection of Claims 3, 10 and 17. However, nowhere do paragraphs 40 and 41 describe the generation of an archive file or wherein generating the archive file includes rewriting a link to reference content on a web page to refer to reference content file in the

archive file. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 3, 10 and 17 should be withdrawn for this additional reason.

III. Added Claims.

With this response, Claims 26-31 are added. Claims 26-31 depend from Claims 1, 9, 16 and 23-25, respectively, and further clarify that a mobile device performs the recited steps. Smith fails to disclose the methods recited in added Claims 26-28 or the computer program product recited in added Claims 29-31. Accordingly, Claims 26-31 are presented for consideration and allowance.

IV. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-31 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Jan. 17, 2006

By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22879
Telephone: (414) 297-5710
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276